

1 Teresa M. Corbin (SBN 132360)
 2 Denise M. De Mory (SBN 168076)
 3 Jaclyn C. Fink (SBN 217913)
 4 HOWREY LLP
 5 525 Market Street, Suite 3600
 6 San Francisco, California 94105
 7 Telephone: (415) 848-4900
 8 Facsimile: (415) 848-4999

9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28

Attorneys for Defendants AEROFLEX INCORPORATED,
 AEROFLEX COLORADO SPRINGS, INC., AMI
 SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., MATROX ELECTRONIC
 SYSTEMS, LTD., MATROX GRAPHICS INC., MATROX
 INTERNATIONAL CORP., and MATROX TECH, INC.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

RICOH COMPANY, LTD.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

AEROFLEX INCORPORATED, AMI
 SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., MATROX
 ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS, LTD., MATROX
 GRAPHICS INC., MATROX
 INTERNATIONAL CORP., MATROX TECH,
 INC., and AEROFLEX COLORADO SPRINGS,
 INC.,

Defendants.

Case No. C03-4669 MJJ (EMC)

**DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY
 JUDGMENT REGARDING THE SCOPE OF
 PATENT DAMAGES FOR ALLEGED
 INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO.
 4,922,432**

CONFIDENTIAL - FILED UNDER SEAL

[SUMMARY JUDGMENT MOTION NO. 7]

Date: September 26, 2006

Time: 9:30 a.m.

Courtroom: 11, 19th Floor

Judge: Martin J. Jenkins

**CONFIDENTIAL - FILED UNDER SEAL
 PURSUANT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER**

REDACTED PUBLIC VERSION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
2	II. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	1
3	III. STATEMENT OF MATERIAL UNDISPUTED FACTS	2
4	A. Ricoh's Damages Reports	3
5	B. The Accused Process Is Only a Small Portion of the Processes (Design and Manufacturing) That Are Involved In Producing An ASIC Or A Graphics Board.....	4
6	C. Logic Synthesis Occurs For Only A Portion of An ASIC.....	5
7	D. Ricoh Seeks Damages for Matrox's Sales Of Accused Products That Are Designed Outside the United States To Customers Located Outside Of The United States.....	6
8	E. Ricoh Also Seeks Damages For Defendant Aeroflex's Sales Of ASICS To The United States Federal Government	6
9	F. Matrox Sells Graphics Boards, Not ASICS	7
10	IV. ARGUMENT	7
11	A. Ricoh Cannot Recover Damages on ASIC and Graphics Board Sales.....	7
12	1. Ricoh Cannot Recover Damages On ASICS or Graphics Board Sales Because Its Damages Theory Violates the Entire Market Value Rule.....	7
13	B. Foreign Sales For ASICS Where Logic Synthesis Occurred Entirely Outside the United States Should Not Be Incorporated Into Damages.....	9
14	1. Ricoh Cannot Recover Damages Under 271(a) or 271(g) Where Logic Synthesis And Sales Occurred Outside The United States.....	9
15	C. Pursuant To 28 U.S.C. Section 1498(a), Ricoh Is Precluded From Recovering Damages For Sales Of Accused Aeroflex Products To Or For The United States Federal Government.....	10
16	D. Sales Of Products For Which Logic Synthesis Occurred Outside The Damages Period Should Not Be Included.....	11
17	E. Ricoh Cannot Recover Damages On Customer Defendants' ASIC Sales Under 271(g).....	11
18	1. 271(g) does not apply to anything but physical products.....	12

1	2.	271(g) does not apply unless the output of the patented process is used directly in the manufacture of a product.....	13
2	3.	271(g) does not apply if the output of the patented process is materially changed by a subsequent process	13
4	V.	CONCLUSION	14

5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

2 CASES

3 <i>Accuscan, Inc. v. Xerox Corp.</i> 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14242	8
4 <i>Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.</i> 477 U.S. 242	7
5 <i>Bayer AG v. Housey Pharms. Inc.</i> 340 F.3d 1367	12, 13
6 <i>Hughes Aircraft Cl. v. U.S.</i> 29 Fed. Cl. 197, 223 (Ct. Cl. 1993)	10
7 <i>Imonex Services, Inc. v. W.H. Muzprufer Dietmar Trenner GMBH</i> 408 F.3d 1374	7, 8, 9
8 <i>International Rectifier Corp. v. Samsung Electrics Co.</i> 361 F.3d 1355	10
9 <i>Maritime, Inc. v. Coin Acceptors, Inc.</i> 1995 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21697	8
10 <i>NTP Inc. v. Research In Motion, Ltd.</i> 418 F.3d 1282	10, 12
11 <i>Phonometrics, Inc. v. N. Telecom, Inc.</i> 133 F.3d 1459	7
12 <i>State Industrial, Inc. v. Mor-Flo Industrial, Inc.</i> 883 F.2d 1573	7
13 <i>Volovik v. Bayer Corp.</i> 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 300	8

19 STATUTES

20 35 U.S.C. §§ 271	2, 9
21 35 U.S.C. § 271	9
22 35 U.S.C. § 271(g)	13
23 35 U.S.C. § 286	2, 11
24 28 U.S.C. § 1498	2, 10, 11

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Defendants Aeroflex Incorporated, Aeroflex Colorado Springs, Inc. (collectively, "Aeroflex"),
 3 AMI Semiconductor, Inc., Matrox Electronic Systems, Ltd., Matrox Graphics Inc., Matrox
 4 International Corp., and Matrox Tech, Inc. (collectively, "Matrox") (collectively, "the Customer
 5 Defendants") move for summary judgment regarding the scope of patent damages, if any, that are
 6 available to Plaintiff Ricoh Company, Ltd. ("Ricoh") should it prevail on its claim that the Customer
 7 Defendants infringe U.S. Patent No. 4,922,432 ("the '432 patent").

8 For the reasons set forth below, the Customer Defendants request that the Court grant their
 9 motion and preclude Ricoh from recovering damages for: (1) royalties based on Customer Defendants'
 10 sales of ASICs and/or graphics boards because Ricoh's damages theory violates the Federal Circuit's
 11 well-settled entire market value rule relating to patent damages; (2) defendant Matrox's sales of
 12 graphics boards that were designed and sold outside the United States; (3) defendant Aeroflex's sales
 13 of ASICs to the United States federal government; (4) defendant Matrox's sales of graphic boards
 14 designed before Ricoh is legally allowed to recover damages in this matter; and (5) Customer
 15 Defendants' ASIC sales under 271(g).

16 **II. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT**

17 Ricoh accuses the Customer Defendants of infringing method claims 13-17 of the '432 patent,
 18 which is directed to a method of designing application specific integrated circuits ("ASICs"). Ricoh
 19 alleges that the Customer Defendants infringe claims 13-17 of the '432 patent through the use of
 20 Synopsys' Design Compiler system that the Customer Defendants license from Synopsys. Ricoh
 21 contends that it is entitled to damages due to the Customer Defendants' alleged infringement of the
 22 '432 patent. Specifically, Ricoh seeks . in total damages. Ricoh's damages number is
 23 comprised of \$ for sales of graphics boards designed and sold inside and outside the United
 24 States by defendant Matrox, \$ for sales of ASICs by defendant AMI, and \$ for
 25 sales of ASICs by defendant Aeroflex.

26 However, Ricoh's damages theory is legally flawed. First, Ricoh improperly seeks to recover
 27 damages for sales of ASICs sold by AMI and Aeroflex and damages for sales of graphics boards sold
 28

1 by Matrox in violation of the entire market value rule. There is no evidence that the use of the
 2 patented process drives demand for either the ASICs or the graphics boards. Accordingly, Ricoh
 3 cannot recover damages based on the sales of ASICS and graphics boards as a matter of law. On this
 4 basis, the royalty base in the damages analysis must be restricted to the value of the accused process.¹

5 Second, Ricoh improperly seeks damages based on defendant Matrox's sales of graphics
 6 boards that were designed outside of the United States and sold outside of the United States. Ricoh is
 7 not able to recover for any sales of graphics boards or designs for graphics boards Matrox created
 8 entirely outside the United States because there is no liability under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a) or 271(g) for
 9 these sales.² Indeed, with regard to many of the Matrox graphics boards products at issue, it is
 10 undisputed that the alleged act of infringement, synthesizing the logic for the ASIC, occurred outside
 11 the United States. As a matter of law, Ricoh cannot recover damages related to sales of graphics
 12 boards that were both designed and sold outside the United States. On this basis, \$ must
 13 be subtracted from Ricoh's proposed royalty base.

14 Third, Ricoh improperly seeks to recover damages for defendant Aeroflex's sales of ASICs to
 15 the United States Federal Government. These sales are also precluded as a matter of law pursuant to
 16 28 U.S.C. § 1498(a). On this basis, \$ must be subtracted from Ricoh's proposed royalty
 17 base.

18 Fourth, Ricoh should be excluded from recovering damages based on alleged infringement that
 19 occurred outside of the damages period pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 286. On this basis, \$ must
 20 be subtracted from Ricoh's proposed royalty base.

21 Finally, Ricoh cannot recover damages on Customer Defendants' ASIC sales under 271(g).

22 **III. STATEMENT OF MATERIAL UNDISPUTED FACTS**

25
 26 ¹ However, neither of Ricoh's damages experts have calculated a royalty base based on the value of the accused process.

27 ² The Customer Defendants dispute that 271(g) applies to products designed in the United States. However, to the extent
 28 that Ricoh argues that it does (and therefore creates an alternative basis for liability for ASICs sales), the same 271(g)
 arguments apply to the designs created within the United States.

A. Ricoh's Damages Reports

Ricoh served two separate damages reports. The expert report of R. Fred Lipscomb focuses primarily on the royalty rate. Indeed, Mr. Lipscomb's describes the limits of his opinion as follows:

Counsel for plaintiff, Ricoh Company, Ltd. (Ricoh) has retained me to provide an opinion regarding what would constitute a reasonable royalty rate to be used to calculate damages to be paid by defendants to Ricoh, for use of its patent in suit, US 4,922,432 (432 patent) issued May 1, 1990

De Mory Decl., Exh. 54 [Expert Report of R. Fred Lipscomb].

8 Mr. Lipscomb's expert report opines that the reasonable royalty rate should be 4.39%. De
9 Mory Decl., Exh. 54 [Lipscomb Report at 23]. Although Mr. Lipscomb's expert report does not
10 provide any identification or discussion of what specific sales of Customer Defendants' products
11 should be included in the royalty base, his report instead, includes the following conclusory language:

“This royalty rate should be multiplied against the net sales of each of the defendant’s products made using the patented process, in the form as first put into the stream of commerce, to obtain the royalty obligations for each fiscal quarter as damages for infringement of the 432 patent.”

¹⁵ De Mory Decl., Exh. 54 [Lipscomb Report at 24].

16 Mr. Lipscomb's expert report does not calculate damages. Instead, Ricoh relies on another "expert,"
17 Maureen Loftus, who describes her assignment as follows in her report:

6. I have calculated plaintiff's damages, attributable to each defendant, by (i) aggregating the alleged infringing sales revenues for the products identified by each of the defendants; and (ii) multiplying those sales revenues by the royalty rate provided by Mr. R. Fred Lipscomb, Ricoh's licensing expert.

²¹ De Mory Decl., Exh. 55 [Expert Report of Maureen S. Loftus at 2-3].

22 Ms. Loftus' report also states that she has "not been asked to form an opinion as to the reasonableness"
23 of Mr. Lipscomb's proposed royalty rate. *Id.* Ms. Loftus provides no opinion on the appropriate
24 royalty base.

²⁵ De Mory Decl., Exh. 55 [Loftus Report at 2].

26 Neither Mr. Lipscomb's nor Ms. Loftus' expert reports opine, analyze or discuss what drives
27 the demand for the Customer Defendants' accused products. Instead, Ms. Loftus simply applies Mr.

28 Lipscomb's , royalty rate to \$1
LLP Case Nos. C03-4669 MJJ (EMC)/C03-2289 MJJ (EMC)
MTN FOR SUMM. JUDG. RE SCOPE OF PATENT DAMAGES
(MOTION NO. 7)
DM 8278976.v1

1 sales made by Aeroflex, and \$ of sales of graphics boards made by Matrox to derive an
 2 alleged damages figure of \$

3 **B. The Accused Process Is Only a Small Portion of the Processes (Design and
 4 Manufacturing) That Are Involved In Producing An ASIC Or A Graphics Board**

5 For purposes of damages in this case, it is important to put the role that the accused process
 6 plays in context. Significantly, the accused process (logic synthesis) is only a small portion of the
 7 process of designing and manufacturing an ASIC.³ There are two main phases required to produce
 8 ASICs. First, the ASIC must be designed. Second, the ASICs themselves are manufactured.

9 The ASIC design process includes many steps. These steps include, but are not limited to,
 10 initial specification creation, simulation, synthesis, floor planning (including place and route), and
 11 verification. *See Declaration of Denise M. De Mory in Support of Defendants' Motion for Summary
 12 Judgment Regarding the Scope of Patent Damages ("De Mory Decl."), Exhs. 57 and 58 [Chiappini
 13 Dep. Tr. Vol. 3, p. 283-285, 293; Ricoh Dkt. No. 305 [Declaration of Erik Olson in Support of
 14 Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment on Noninfringement Under 35 U.S.C. § 271(g) ("Olson
 15 Decl.")].* The design phase ends with the creation of mask data, by programs other than the Design
 16 Compiler system. *See Olson Decl., ¶ 7.* After the mask data is created, the manufacturing process
 17 begins. De Mory Decl. Exh. 60; (Ricoh Dkt. No. 306 [Declaration of Michael Heynes in Support of
 18 Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment on Noninfringement Under 35 U.S.C. § 271(g) ("Heynes
 19 Decl."), ¶ 4].

20 In the initial phase of the manufacturing process, the physical masks needed to manufacture the
 21 ASIC are created. *See Heynes Decl., ¶¶ 5 and 6.* The masks are sent to a foundry that then transfer,
 22 through a series of steps, the designs on the masks to a silicon wafer. *See Heynes Decl., ¶¶ 12-14.* The
 23 wafer is then further processed and, ultimately, individual ASICs are packaged, generally at a different
 24 facility, and often in a different country, than the foundry. Then, the ASICs can be sold.

25
 26
 27 ³ Ricoh consistently attempts to conflate the design and manufacturing process. Indeed, Ricoh has, claimed that the '432
 28 patent covers the process for manufacturing an ASIC, which the Court has already determined it did not.

1 In the case of Matrox, in addition to the entire ASIC process described above, it must design
 2 the graphics board on which the ASIC will ultimately be contained. *See* De Mory Decl., Exh. 56
 3 [Chiappini Dep. Tr. Vol. 1, p. 70, ll. 13-23]. This includes designing or identifying the other
 4 components for the board, as well as physically manufacturing the boards.

5 It is important to realize that only the step above called “synthesis” includes the Design
 6 Compiler system processing that is allegedly covered by the ‘432 patent. It is undisputed that logic
 7 synthesis is simply one out of many steps in the production of an ASIC, and the data that is output
 8 from the logic synthesis step undergoes substantial transformation prior to becoming a saleable ASIC
 9 or graphics board.

10 **C. Logic Synthesis Occurs For Only A Portion of An ASIC**

11 Moreover, for many of the accused ASICs or graphics boards, the accused process was used
 12 only to synthesize a small portion of the logic level design of the ASIC. First, the Customer
 13 Defendants all use Design Compiler for logic synthesis of only the digital portion of what are known
 14 as mixed signal ASICs. Mixed signal ASICS are ASICS that have an analog and a digital portion. In
 15 the case of the accused products of the Customer Defendants, a large number of the accused ASICs are
 16 mixed signal ASICs for which the analog portion of the designs did not use Design Compiler at all.
 17 Casavant Decl., ¶ 8.

18

19

20

21

Casavant Decl., ¶ 9.

22 In addition, there are other portions of an ASIC that Design Compiler does not synthesize. For
 23 example, Design Compiler does not synthesize instantiated pad cells, asynchronous logic, and hand-
 24 instantiated logic. Casavant Decl., ¶ 10. No analysis has been provided by Ricoh with regard to this
 25 list of things that Design Compiler does not synthesize.

26

27

28

The items listed above,

occur frequently in the Customer Defendants' accused products. None of these items undergoes logic synthesis, and yet must be included in the final ASIC.

D. Ricoh Seeks Damages for Matrox's Sales Of Accused Products That Are Designed Outside the United States To Customers Located Outside Of The United States

The following Matrox ASICs were designed outside the United States:

⁵. De Mory Decl., Exhs. 60 and

61 [Matrox Graphics and Matrox Electronic Systems Product Declarations]. In addition to providing information on where each ASIC was designed, Matrox provided information to Ricoh in the form of native Microsoft Excel files to identify the shipping address of its customers, including whether they are located in the United States. De Mory Decl., Exh. 62 [MGI 688426 – MGI 688481].

The shipping information associated with each customer number can be compared to the MGI and MES sales files. Although defendant Matrox's production of this information in electronic form provided Ms. Loftus the facility to identify foreign transactions with minimal effort, she did not do so. These foreign sales of graphics boards designed outside the United States comprise \$228,856,583 of Matrox sales that Ricoh has inappropriately included in its royalty base.

E. Ricoh Also Seeks Damages For Defendant Aeroflex's Sales Of ASICs To The United States Federal Government

Aeroflex has supplied radiation hardened ASICs to or for government customers. De Mory Decl., Exh. 63 [Schedule 2.1.1 of Wagner Report]. During the damages period, Aeroflex's sales of accused ASICs was \$57,360,574. *Id.* Approximately _____ of these sales, _____, have been documented as being sales to or for government customers. *Id.* Aeroflex sells directly to governmental agencies, and also makes sales to the U.S. government through government contractors. Some examples of government contractors that Aeroflex sells to

⁴ Ricoh did not include this product in its damages reports.

⁵ Ricoh did not include this product in its damages reports.

1
2 Milliken Decl., Exh. 1. As a matter of law, these sales should be deducted from the
3 royalty base.

4 **F. Matrox Sells Graphics Boards, Not ASICs**

5 For AMI and Aeroflex, Ricoh's suggested royalty base includes the sales of the accused ASICs.
6 However, for Matrox, Ricoh's suggested royalty base apparently includes the sales of its graphics
7 boards that include one or more accused ASICs. A graphics board sells for upward of several hundred
8 dollars to over a thousand dollars, while an ASIC sells for less than a hundred dollars. Wagner Decl.,
9 Exh. 1 [Wagner Report page 37]. The average cost of an ASIC for a Matrox board is only _____ of the
10 cost of the graphics board. Wagner Decl., Exh.1 [Wagner Report schedule 8.1.5.]

11 **IV. ARGUMENT**

12 A motion for summary judgment should be granted when the Court determines that there is no
13 genuine issue of material fact to be tried and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of
14 law. Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c); *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 247 (1986); *Phonometrics,*
15 *Inc. v. N. Telecom, Inc.*, 133 F.3d 1459, 1463 (Fed. Cir. 1998). Summary judgment is appropriate
16 when no “reasonable jury could return a verdict for the nonmoving party.” *Anderson*, 477 U.S. at 247-
17 48. Notably, “the mere existence of *some* alleged factual dispute between the parties will not defeat an
18 otherwise properly supported motion for summary judgment; the requirement is that there be no
19 genuine issue of material fact.” *Id.*

20 **A. Ricoh Cannot Recover Damages on ASIC and Graphics Board Sales**

21 **1. Ricoh Cannot Recover Damages On ASICs or Graphics Board Sales**

22 **Because Its Damages Theory Violates the Entire Market Value Rule**

23 Under well-settled Federal Circuit law, the “entire market value rule” permits recovery of
24 damages based on the value of an entire product including several features *only* where the basis for
25 customer demand is the patented feature. *See Imonex Services, Inc. v. W.H. Muzprufer Dietmar*
26 *Trenner GMBH*, 408 F.3d 1374, 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2005), citing *State Indus., Inc. v. Mor-Flo Indus., Inc.*,
27 883 F.2d 1573, 1580 (Fed. Cir. 1989). However, both of Ricoh's expert reports fail to contain any
28 evidence that the customer demand for Aeroflex's and AMI's ASICs, and Matrox's graphics boards, is

1 based on the use of the Synopsys Design Compiler system for logic synthesis for ASICs.⁶ Therefore,
 2 as a matter of law, Ricoh cannot use the entire market value rule. *See Imonex*, 408 F.3d at 1380;
 3 *Volovik v. Bayer Corp.*, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 300, *28-32 (D. Minn. January 7, 2004) (summary
 4 judgment motion granted prohibiting use of entire market value rule where there was no evidence that
 5 allegedly infringing pumps were the basis of the customer demand for an immunoassay system);
 6 *Accuscan, Inc. v. Xerox Corp.*, 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14242, *28-31 (S.D.N.Y. September 10, 1998)
 7 (new trial on damages granted where there was no evidence in the record that the patented invention of
 8 calibrating electric signals formed the basis for customer demand for copier, facsimile, and scanner
 9 products); *Mars, Inc. v. Coin Acceptors, Inc.*, 1995 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21697, *6-9 (D.N.J. October 30,
 10 1995) (entire market value rule not applicable where there was no evidence that basis for customer
 11 demand for coin changer was patented coin tube feature).

12 Without providing any analysis at all regarding the relationship between the claimed method of
 13 the '432 patent and the Customer Defendants' accused products, Mr. Lipscomb determined that a
 14 royalty rate of should be applied to "the net sales of each of the defendant's products made
 15 using the patented process, in the form as first put into the stream of commerce." De Mory Decl., Exh.
 16 54 [Lipscomb Report at 24]. Again, without any analysis, Ms. Loftus applied Mr. Lipscomb's royalty
 17 rate to the Customer Defendants' sales of ASICs for AMI and Aeroflex and graphics boards for
 18 Matrox. *See* De Mory Decl., Exh. 55.

19 Ricoh's damages analysis clearly violates the entire market value rule. The *Imonex* case is
 20 particularly instructive. The patents at issue involved a coin selector used in pay-per-use laundry
 21 machines. After a jury decided that the plaintiff's patents for coin selectors were infringed, the District
 22 Court held a trial on damages.

23 Before trial, the plaintiff sought damages based not only on the value of the coin selecting
 24 apparatus, but on the entire laundry machine to which the coin operation was installed. *Imonex*, 408

25
 26
 27 ⁶ Indeed, it is undisputed that the Customer Defendants' use of the Synopsys Design Compiler system for logic synthesis
 28 does not serve as the basis for customer demand for either ASICs or graphics boards. *See* Declaration of Peter Milliken ¶5
 and Declaration of David Chiappini ¶5.

1 F.3d at 1379. After being precluded from such a damages theory based upon the entire laundry
 2 machine, the court *sua sponte* allowed a claim for damages for the coin selectors, but the jury
 3 apparently made its award based upon the entire market value rule, which the Court then rejected and
 4 ordered a new trial on damages.

5 In the second trial on damages, the defendants' damages expert testified about the income
 6 attributable to the coin selectors. The jury then awarded a greatly decreased amount of damages.
 7 Imonex appealed the Court's decision to exclude its expert's testimony on the entire market value rule.
 8 After indicating that the proposed testimony did not bear any relation to the rule, the Federal Circuit
 9 held that, “[w]ithout any evident record that the patented features were the basis for customer demand
 10 for the laundry machines as a whole, the trial court properly foreclosed further evidence on this
 11 unsupported theory.” *Id.* at 1380.

12 In this case, neither one of Ricoh's damages expert reports provide any evidence that logic
 13 synthesis using Synopsys' Design Compiler system was the basis for customer demand for the
 14 Customer Defendants' ASICs or graphics boards. Ricoh should be foreclosed from pursuing this
 15 unsupported theory of damages at trial. Therefore, as a matter of law, Ricoh cannot recover damages
 16 under the entire market value rule for the sale of these products.

17 **B. Foreign Sales For ASICs Where Logic Synthesis Occurred Entirely Outside the
 18 United States Should Not Be Incorporated Into Damages**

19 **1. Ricoh Cannot Recover Damages Under 271(a) or 271(g) Where Logic
 20 Synthesis And Sales Occurred Outside The United States**

21 As a matter of law Ricoh cannot recover damages for products designed outside of the United
 22 States and sold outside of the United States. The only section of the Patent Statute that applies to
 23 methods performed outside the United States is 35 U.S.C. § 271(g). Plaintiff cannot recover damages
 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).

25 There is no dispute that the following Matrox ASICs contained in its graphics boards were
 26 completely designed outside the United States:

27 . Sales of the graphics boards containing these ASICs outside the
 28 United States fall outside the scope of Section 271(a). *See NTP*, 418 F.3d at 1313 (“The territorial

1 reach of section 271 is limited. Section 271(a) is only actionable again patent infringement that occurs
 2 within the United States."); *see also International Rectifier Corp. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.*, 361 F.3d
 3 1355, 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2004).⁷ Since the Matrox graphics boards containing the ASICs listed above
 4 were sold to foreign customers, as a matter of law, 271(g) also does not apply. Therefore, foreign sales
 5 of \$ for the graphics boards including these ASICs should be removed from the Ricoh's
 6 proposed royalty base.

7 **C. Pursuant To 28 U.S.C. Section 1498(a), Ricoh Is Precluded From Recovering**
 8 **Damages For Sales Of Accused Aeroflex Products To Or For The United States**
 9 **Federal Government.**

10 Ricoh's proposed royalty base is also overstated and improper because, as a matter of law,
 11 Ricoh is precluded from recovering any damages from defendant Aeroflex for the sales of any
 12 Aeroflex products made to or for the United States Federal Government. Section 1498(a) provides in
 13 pertinent part:

14 Whenever a patented invention described in and covered by a patent of the United
 15 States is used or manufactured by or for the United States without license ... *the*
16 owner's remedy shall be by action against the United States in the United States Court
17 of Federal Claims for the recovery of his reasonable and entire compensation for such
 18 use and manufacture.... [T]he use or manufacture of an invention described in and
 covered by a patent of the United States *by a contractor, a subcontractor, or any*
person, firm, or corporation for the Government and with the authorization and consent
of the Government, shall be construed as use or manufacture for the United States.

19 28 U.S.C. § 1498(a) (emphasis added).

20 Under this statute, there are two types of authorization and consent. The authorization may be
 21 either explicit, or it may be implied. *See Hughes Aircraft Cl. v. U.S.*, 29 Fed. Cl. 197, 223 (Ct. Cl.
 22 1993). There are express authorization and consent clauses in effect for \$ of sales of
 23 Aeroflex ASICs to or for the United States. De Mory Decl., ¶ 66. These sales should be removed
 24

25
 26 ⁷ In addition, for 271(a) to be applicable for a process patent, every step of the process must occur in the United States. *See*
NTP, 418 F.3d at 1318 ("[w]e therefore hold that a process cannot be used "within" the United States as required by section
 27 271(a) unless each of the steps is performed within this country.") Therefore, under 271(a) Ricoh is unable to recover
 damages for the AMI and Matrox products designed entirely outside the United States, as well as for any ASICs where any
 step in the claimed process occurred outside the U.S.

1 from Ricoh's proposed royalty base. There is an additional \$ of Aeroflex ASIC sales for
 2 which there is documentation showing sales to or for the United States for which authorization and
 3 consent may be implied.⁸ De Mory Decl., ¶ 66. These sales should also be removed from Ricoh's
 4 proposed royalty base. Therefore, Ricoh is not entitled to receive damages on a total of \$ of
 5 Aeroflex sales pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1498(a).

6 **D. Sales Of Products For Which Logic Synthesis Occurred Outside The Damages
 7 Period Should Not Be Included**

8 Patent damages law is clear that “[e]xcept as otherwise provided by law, no recovery shall be
 9 had for any infringement committed more than six years prior to the filing of the complaint or
 10 counterclaim for infringement in the action.” (35 USC § 286)

11 Ricoh has claimed damages for the VIA/1 product.⁹ As Eric Boisvert, the Vision Processor
 12 Product Line Supervisor, testified, the VIA/1 product did not undergo synthesis. See De Mory Decl.,
 13 Exh. 65 [Boisvert Depo. Tr. at 201 and 215]. Instead, it reused the synthesis from the VIA/0 product.
 14 Id. at 202-215. The synthesis for the VIA/0 product occurred prior to the start of the damages period
 15 which is January 20, 1997 – six years prior to the filing of the complaint. *Id.* at 215. Therefore, there is
 16 no synthesis in the VIA/1 product that occurred during the damages period of this case. Accordingly,
 17 the \$ in sales of the VIA/1 product should be removed from the royalty base for Matrox
 18 Electronic Systems. De Mory Decl., Exh. 55 [Loftus Report at 8].

19 **E. Ricoh Cannot Recover Damages On Customer Defendants' ASIC Sales Under
 20 271(g)**

21 Even if Ricoh's damages analysis did not violate the entire market value rule, Ricoh would still
 22 not be able to recover damages based on Customer Defendants ASIC sales pursuant to 271(g) for three
 23
 24
 25

26 ⁸ There are a number of instances where Aeroflex believes that there is an express authorization and consent clause, but the
 27 source contract cannot be located. In these circumstances, the sales have been included in the implied category.

28 ⁹ The VIA/1 was mistakenly included on the supplemental product declaration based on a misunderstanding of the scope of
 products that should be included.

1 reasons.¹⁰ First, the output of the patented process is information, not a physical product. Second, the
 2 ASICS are not “made by” the allegedly infringing process. Third, the output of the allegedly infringing
 3 process is “materially changed” by subsequent processes prior to the manufacture of the ASICS.

4 **1. 271(g) does not apply to anything but physical products**

5 The output of the claimed process is a netlist for claims 13 and 15-17, and mask data for claim
 6 14. Neither a netlist nor mask data is a physical product. Instead, both are information. Since 271(g)
 7 is applicable only to physical products, and not to information, it does not apply to the output from
 8 these method claims. *See NTP, Inc. v. Research In Motion, Ltd.*, 481 F.3d 1282, 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2005).

9 In *NTP*, the claims at issue were directed to methods for the transmission of information in the
 10 form of email messages. After reiterating that the production of information was not covered by
 11 271(g), since the patented process must include the manufacturing of a physical product for 271(g) to
 12 be applicable, the Court said that, “[b]ecause the ‘transmission of information,’ like the ‘production of
 13 information,’ does not entail the manufacturing of a physical product, section 271(g) does not apply to
 14 the asserted method claims in this case any more than it did in *Bayer*.” *Id.* *See also Bayer AG v.*
 15 *Housey Pharms. Inc.*, 340 F.3d 1367, 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (“in order for a product to have been
 16 ‘made by a process patented in the United States’ it must have been a physical article that was
 17 ‘manufactured’ and that the production of information is not covered.”) In this case, as in *Bayer* and
 18 *NTP*, the output of the process is information, in the form of a netlist or mask data, rather than a
 19 manufactured physical product. Therefore, 271(g) does not apply in this case any more than it did in
 20 *Bayer* or *NTP*.

21

22

23

24

25

¹⁰ Ricoh cannot claim board sales because under no circumstances is the output of design compiler used directly in the manufacture of graphics boards. Except in a few cases, Matrox does not sell its ASICS directly to its customers. Instead, Matrox includes its ASICS on its sophisticated graphics boards.

27 (Wagner Decl. Exh. 1 (Sch. 8.1.5))
 28

1 **2. 271(g) does not apply unless the output of the patented process is used**
 2 **directly in the manufacture of a product**

3 As discussed above, the output of the patented process is a netlist or mask data, not an ASIC.
 4 The Court in *Bayer* indicated that “the process must be used directly in the manufacture of the
 5 product.” *Id.* at 1378. In this case, under no circumstances can the data that is the output of Design
 6 Compiler be used directly in the manufacture of an ASIC. In the first instance, the output of Design
 7 Compiler is just one of many steps in the design process. More importantly, in the case of the ASICs
 8 at issue here – the output of Design Compiler, alone, cannot be used to manufacture the ASIC. As
 9 Ricoh has now discovered, .

10

11 : This other information must be combined with
 12 the output from Design Compiler.

13 In addition, the netlist output from Design Compiler must be modified by the place-and-route
 14 process to create another netlist, which is processed to generate GDSII data, which is further processed
 15 to produce mask data. Netlists and mask data are not used to manufacture an ASIC at all.
 16 Photomasks, which are generated from mask data, are used in the actual manufacture of an ASIC.

17 The output of the patented process is either a netlist or mask data. Since neither a netlist nor
 18 mask data is used directly in the manufacture of an ASIC, the ASICs are not “made by” a patented
 19 process. Therefore, 271(g) is not applicable to the ASICs.

20 **3. 271(g) does not apply if the output of the patented process is materially**
 21 **changed by a subsequent process**

22 Section 271(g)(1) provides that a product will not be considered to be “made by” a patented
 23 process if “it is materially changed by a subsequent process.” 35 U.S.C. § 271(g)(1). Before an ASIC
 24 is produced, the netlist output from Design Compiler is materially changed. First,

25

26 . Second, the
 27 combined netlist partially output from Design Compiler, and otherwise created by hand or with other
 28 software,

These masks are then used in the generation, layer by layer, of the final ASIC, which is then packaged and sold.

These ASICs may be sent to yet another location for packaging.

Clearly, the output of the patented process is materially changed before an ASIC is produced. Therefore, the ASIC cannot be considered to be “made by” the patented process, and cannot be covered by 271(g).

V. CONCLUSION

For all the foregoing reasons, the Customer Defendants respectfully request that this Court grant their motion for summary judgment and preclude Ricoh from recovering damages for: (1) royalties based on the sales of the Customer Defendants' ASICs and graphics boards, in violation of the Federal Circuit "entire market value rule," and (2) defendant Matrox's sales of graphics boards that were designed and sold outside the United States; and (3) defendant Aeroflex's sales of ASICs to the United States federal government; and (4) defendant Matrox's sales of graphics boards designed before Ricoh is legally allowed to recover damages in this matter; and (5) Customer Defendants' ASIC sales under 271(g).

1 Dated: August 18, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

2 HOWREY LLP

3

4 By: /s/ Denise M. De Mory

5 Denise M. De Mory

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff

7 SYNOPSYS and Defendants AEROFLEX
8 INCORPORATED, AEROFLEX
9 COLORADO SPRINGS, INC., AMI
10 SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., MATROX
11 ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS, LTD.,
12 MATROX GRAPHICS INC., MATROX
13 INTERNATIONAL CORP., and
14 MATROX TECH, INC.